

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

From the:
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

To:

Baldwins
PO Box 5999
Wellesley Street
Auckland
NEW ZEALAND

PCT

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

(PCT Rule 43bis.1)

Date of mailing (day/month/year)	4 FEB 2005
-------------------------------------	------------

Applicant's or agent's file reference
504423/142

FOR FURTHER ACTION
See paragraph 2 below

International application No.
PCT/NZ2004/000136

International filing date (day/month/year)
30 June 2004

Priority date (day/month/year)
2 July 2003

International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC
Int. Cl. ⁷ A23L 1/10

Applicant

GRANATE SEED LIMITED et al

1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Box No. I | Basis of the opinion |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Box No. II | Priority |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Box No. III | Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Box No. IV | Lack of unity of invention |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Box No. V | Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Box No. VI | Certain documents cited |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Box No. VII | Certain defects in the international application |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Box No. VIII | Certain observations on the international application |

2. FURTHER ACTION

If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA") except that this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.

If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of 3 months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.

For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.

3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.

Name and mailing address of the IPEA/AU
AUSTRALIAN PATENT OFFICE
PO BOX 200, WODEN ACT 2606, AUSTRALIA
E-mail address: pct@ipaustalia.gov.au
Facsimile No. (02) 6285 3929

Authorized Officer

JAMIE TURNER
Telephone No. (02) 6283 2071

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.

PCT/NZ2004/000136

Box No. I Basis of the opinion

1. With regard to the language, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in the language in which it was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.
☐ This opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into the following language _____, which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rules 12.3 and 23.1(b)).
2. With regard to any nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:
 - a. type of material
☐ a sequence listing
☐ table(s) related to the sequence listing
 - b. format of material
☐ in written format
☐ in computer readable form
 - c. time of filing/furnishing
☐ contained in the international application as filed.
☐ filed together with the international application in computer readable form.
☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.
3. ☐ In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.
4. Additional comments:

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.

PCT/NZ2004/000136

Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43b/s.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. Statement

Novelty (N)	Claims 1-10	YES
	Claims 11-33	NO
Inventive step (IS)	Claims 1-10	YES
	Claims 11-33	NO
Industrial applicability (IA)	Claims 1-33	YES
	Claims	NO

2. Citations and explanations:

The following citations, first raised in the corresponding International Search Report, are referred to as follows:

D1 – US 5 512 287

The invention relates to β -Glucan containing processed cereal grains and methods of producing same. It would appear that there is a need to provide cereal grains which release more β -Glucan (hence improving efficiency) wherein the β -Glucan has a higher molecular weight (which provides certain physiological advantages). It is apparent that this is achieved by heating the cereal grain to a high temperature (above 95C) with greater than 50% water (see, for example, page 8, paragraphs 1-2) because such conditions denatures the degrading enzymes, including beta-amylases and alpha-amylases.

Claims 1-3 relate to a β -Glucan processed cereal grain product possessing certain properties, namely when mixed with water at temperatures between 0 to 55C releases at least 60% of its β -Glucan into the water (claim 1) or when mixed with water in a weight to volume ratio of 1 to 20 at temperatures of approximately 37C for one hour releases 60% of the β -Glucan into the water (claims 2-3), the β -Glucan so released has an average molecular weight of at least greater than approximately 100,000 Daltons (claims 1-2) and/or a specific viscosity greater than approximately 2.0cSt at β -Glucan of approximately 0.5% by weight.

Claim 11 relates to a method of producing a β -Glucan containing product comprising heating β -Glucan containing cereal grain above approximately 60C in the presence of greater than approximately 50% water followed by drying.

D1 discloses a method of production of β -Glucan and the product thereof. In the method, cereal grains are ground, slurried in water below the starch gelatinisation temperature. Bran, starch granules and protein are removed. β -Glucan is precipitated and dehydrated with alcohol, screened and ground to become a white colored product with a neutral flavour. This method recovers 33 to 75% of the total naturally occurring β -Glucan in cereal grains. The recovered β -Glucan is water soluble and has molecular weight from 400,000 to 2,000,000 Daltons.

While it would appear that the β -Glucan produced by the process of D1 is at least similar to that defined by claims 1-3, the processed cereal grains of claims 1-3 (and claims appended thereto) can be distinguished from the β -Glucan of D1 in that the present invention does not require any grinding to release the β -Glucan. That is, claims 1-3 define a "cereal grain product" rather than a ground cereal grain product. Further, given that claims 1-3 are aimed at a different technical problem to D1 (that is, a "cereal grain product" which release β -Glucan under certain water and temperature conditions), it is apparent that claims 1-3 (and claims appended thereto) must be considered inventive.

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International Application No.

PCT/NZ2004/000136

Supplemental Box

In case the space in any of the preceding boxes is not sufficient.

Continuation of: V

Claim 11 (and claims appended thereto) do not appear to exclude the possibility of grinding the grain. Hence the process disclosed in D1 appears to fall squarely within claim 11. Claims 11-33 must, therefore, be considered to lack novelty in the light of D1.

Further, even in the absence of D1, claim 11 cannot be considered novel when compared to standard cooking techniques, including the preparation of boiled or steamed rice in a microwave oven or the stovetop preparation of porridge (oatmeal), both of which involves heating a β -Glucan cereal above 60C in the presence of greater than 50% water followed by drying (such as further heating). It would appear that a great many such techniques would fall within the scope of claim 11.

Claims 11-33 must therefore be considered to lack both novelty and inventive step.